

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated October 21, 2008. Claims 29-35 and 62 are pending in the present application. Claims 19-20, 36-40, 61, and 63 have been withdrawn due to a prior restriction requirement. Claims 29-35 and 62 are rejected. In response, Claims 29 and 30 have been amended. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that the amendments made to Claims 19, 29, and 36 in the Response dated October 16, 2007, and entered by the Patent Office, were not reflected in the Listing of the Claims of the Applicant's Response dated July 14, 2008. Specifically, in the Response dated July 14, 2008, Claims 19 and 29 failed to recite the element "*wherein at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets are structured in a format that allows the at least one ticket to be assigned from the information storage chip to at least one other information storage chip using the electronic ticket platform center,*" and Claim 36 failed to recite the element "an information storage chip of a customer." The Listing of the Claims presented above now properly recites these elements, although not indicated as current amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, Claims 29-31, 33-35, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105641 to Lewis ("Lewis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,227 to Goldstein et al. ("Goldstein"). Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, in view of Goldstein, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 6,067,532 to Gebb ("Gebb"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 29 has been amended to recite, in part, "forming event information unique to the event, forming seller information authorizing the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus to sell electronic tickets to the event, and registering the event information and the seller information in the electronic ticket platform center by the event organizer apparatus." The amendment is fully supported by the specification. For example, see paragraphs [0129] and [0146] of the specification.

Claim 30 has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein the seller information authorizes a plurality of electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatuses and includes the number of electronic tickets to be handled by each of the plurality of electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatuses.” The amendment is fully supported by the specification. For example, see paragraphs [0129] and [0146] of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art, even if properly combinable, fails to recite all the elements of independent Claim 29.

First, Applicants respectfully submit the cited prior art fails to disclose, at a minimum, forming event information unique to the event, forming seller information authorizing the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus to sell electronic tickets to the event, and registering the event information and the seller information in the electronic ticket platform center by the event organizer apparatus. The Patent Office relies on Lewis’ system to represent the organizer apparatus. See Office Action, page 8, lines 15-21. Lewis, at paragraph [0010], discloses allowing “a consumer to select a venue, select an event at the venue, select a seating preference, and select a method of payment for the purchase of a ticket.” However, Applicants respectfully submit this series of events only allows a customer to plan attendance to an event by purchasing tickets from a vendor, and does not allow an event organizer to form and register event information itself in a ticket platform center. Lewis only allows a user of the system to sell tickets contained in the vendor computer system 18. See Lewis, paragraphs [0020]-[0022]. However, Lewis fails to teach an event organizer apparatus that forms event information itself and authorizes who can sell tickets to the event.

Second, Applicants respectfully disagree Lewis’ ticket/smart card teaches the electronic ticket platform center as claimed and fully supported by the specification. The Patent Office states, “[s]ince information about the seat location and event is recorded on the ticket/smart card, this represents registering the event information in the electronic ticket platform center since the smart card is the source for distributing electronic ticket information.” Office Action, page 9, lines 6-9. However, seller information authorizing the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus to sell electronic tickets, as claimed, is not contained on Lewis’ ticket/smart card. Moreover, Applicants claim the electronic ticket platform center performs ticket issuing processing for writing the electronic ticket information into the information storage

chip. Applicants respectfully submit Lewis' ticket/smart does not issue processing for writing the electronic ticket information on itself as would be necessary if the ticket/smart card represented the electronic platform center.

Dependent Claim 30 has been amended to further clarify the difference between the claimed invention and the cited prior art. Lewis discloses a single vender computer system issues a ticket to a customer. See Lewis, paragraphs [0020]-[0022]. "A validation system 24 which is connected to or associated with the vendor computer system 18 is placed at the location or site of the event." Lewis, paragraph [0022]. "Information read or entered from the ticket 22 is transmitted from the validation system 24 to the vendor computer system 18. The vendor computer system 18 verifies that the ticket 22 is valid for the event and sends a signal over the connection 26 to the validation system 24 which permits the customer to enter." *Id.* Thus, Lewis fails to teach a plurality of vendor computer systems issuing tickets to a single event. A problem is then created as to how to manage a plurality of vendor computer systems issuing tickets to a single event because validation only occurs by the vendor computer system that issued the ticket. The present invention solves this problem by registering seller information, that includes a plurality of electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatuses that are authorized to sell tickets to an event, into the electronic ticket platform center. The electronic ticket platform center can then manage "the distribution of the electronic ticket information" as claimed. Moreover, Lewis is altogether silent regarding the number of electronic tickets to be handled by each of the plurality of electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatuses as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit Goldstein and Gebb fail to cure the deficiencies of Lewis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection with respect to independent Claim 29 and Claims 30-35 and 62 that depend thereon be reconsidered and the rejections withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of the same.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-459 on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso

Reg. No. 46,541

Customer No. 29175

Dated: January 21, 2009